



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON THE PHILONEAN TEXT OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

It is known from the history of Eusebius that Philo wrote six Books of *Quæstiones et Responsiones in Genesin*, which have only come down to us in an Armenian Version, executed about the year 400 A.D. In these *Quæstiones* the text of the Septuagint was taken and expounded verse by verse ; so that no other work of this writer supplies us with so long a series of texts taken methodically one after another. Philo must, in fact, have written his commentary with a text of the LXX. lying open before him. The evidence of these *Quæstiones*, as bearing on the Philonean text of the LXX., has never yet been arrayed. In the following pages the old Armenian of each *Quæstio* is translated back into Greek, a task of no great difficulty and fraught with little uncertainty on account of the extreme literalness of the version. The writer constantly has in view the great Oxford edition of the LXX. by Robert Holmes. Where the Philonean citation reflects the reading of particular MSS. collated for that edition, the fact is duly noted ; but the *Responsio* of Philo is only quoted if it affords additional evidence as to the way in which Philo read any passage. All references to the *Quæstiones* are based upon an inspection of the Armenian text itself, and are not taken from the Latin translation of Paschal Aucher, which, however, is very excellent and scholarly. The citations in this Paper begin with Genesis iv. 1. The works of Philo preserved in Greek are sparingly referred to, partly because the citations they contain have already been duly noted, and partly because no further consultation of them is needed, until a new and critical text appears. No fresh evidence, however, supplied by such a text will in any way abrogate conclusions based on the Armenian Text of the *Quæstiones*.

PHILONIS DE QUÆSTIONIBUS QUÆ IN GENESI SUNT.

SERMO I.

Qu. 58.—Genesis, ch. iv. 1: *Εἰ ὁρθῶς ἐλέχθη ἐπὶ τοῦ Κάιν ἐκτῆσάμην ἄνθρωπον διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ*;

Qu. 59.—Ch. iv. 2: *Διὰ τί τοῦ νεωτέρου Ἀβελ πρότερον τὸ ἔργον ἀναγράφει, λέγων ἐγένετο ποιμὴν προβάτων, Κάιν δὲ ἦν ἐργαζόμενος τὴν γῆν*;

The rough breathing Ἀβελ for Ἀβελ is found also in the Arm. Vulgate, which, however, implies *η* for *ε*: Ἀβηλ instead of Ἀβελ. In the old Arm. version of Philo's *Liber de Nominibus Hebraicis* (as given in the Codex CXXXI. 9. 28 of the Library of the University of Pavia) Ἀβελ is given.

Qu. 60.—Ch. iv. : *Διὰ τί Κάιν μεθ' ἡμέρας τῶν ἀπαρχῶν πρωτογενήματα ἀνελὼν ἤνεγκε. Ἀβελ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν πρωτόκων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν στεάτων οὐ μεθ' ἡμέρας*;

Tischendorf reads μεθ' ἡμέρας ἤνεγκε Κάιν ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν τῆς γῆς θυσίαν τῷ κυρίῳ. In L. D. SS. Ab. et. C. i. 171, the citation is given thus: καὶ ἐγένετο μεθ' ἡμέρας, ἤνεγκε Κάιν ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ τῆς γῆς δῶρον τῷ Κυρίῳ, but the following commentary is added: *Δύο ἐγκλήματα τοῦ φιλαύτου. ἐν μὲν τὸ μεθ' ἡμέρας, ἀλλ' οὐκ εὐθὺς εὐχαριστῆσαι τῷ θεῷ, ἕτερον δὲ τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀπὸ τῶν πρώτων καρπῶν, ὧν σύνθετον ὄνομα πρωτογενήματα.*

The Armenian solutio of quaest. 60 would run thus in the original Greek: *τοῦ φιλαύτου καὶ τοῦ φιλοθέου τὴν διαφορὰν ἱστορεῖ, ἑτέρου μὲν τοῦ ἐαυτῷ δοντὸς τῶν πρωτογεννημάτων τοὺς καρποὺς καὶ τὸν θεὸν ἀσεβῶς τῶν δευτερείων ἀξιώσαντος· τὸ μεθ' ἡμέρας γάρ, ἀλλ' οὐκ εὐθὺς, τό τε ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν πρώτων καρπῶν, τοιαύτην ἀσέβειαν δηλοῖ· τοῦ δὲ ἑτέρου τὰ πρωτότοκα καὶ πρεσβύτερα καθιεροῦντος ἄνευ μελλήσεως διὰ παντὸς καὶ τοῦ καταφρονεῖν τοῦ θεοῦ (or perhaps τὸν θεόν).*

The Armenian quaestio therefore really suggests no departure from Tischendorf's text, although the citation in the Greek in Philo i. 171, does imply δῶρον for θυσίαν. Δῶρον probably stood in Philo's LXX., for Ambrose has

munus. The Armenian Vulgate also has δῶρον. It is probable that δῶρον was at some later date than Philo's substituted for θυσίαν, owing to the words which follow in ver. 5, ἐπὶ δὲ Κάιν καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς θυσίαις αὐτοῦ. But this also is doubtful, for in Philo i. 180, we read: τὰ μὲν δὴ τοῦ Καῖν μεθ' ἡμέρας φέροντος τὴν θυσίαν ἐγκλήματα τοιαῦτα ἦν.

Qu. 61.—Ch. iv. 4, 5: Διὰ τί τὸ πρῶτον Κάιν ἀρχὴν ποιησάμενος ἐν δευτέρῳ τόπῳ μέμνηται· φησὶ γὰρ· ἐπείδεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ Ἀβὲλ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις· ἐπὶ δὲ Κάιν καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς θυσίαις οὐκ ἠρέσθη;

The omission of αὐτοῦ twice, after δώροις and after θυσίαις, seems due to title only. If a very simple corruption can be supposed in the Armenian, οὐ πρόσσεσχεν would stand, but see upon Qu. 63.

Qu. 62.—Ch. iv. 4, 5: Τίνα ἀφορισμὸν ἔχει δῶρον ἀπὸ θυσιῶν;

Qu. 63.—Ch. iv. 5: Πόθεν ἤδη Κάιν ὅτι οὐκ ἤρεσκεν αὐτῷ τὸ δῶρον; The solutio also bears on the text of the LXX., and would run thus in Greek: Μήποτε διαλύει τὴν ἀπορίαν ἡ αἰτία ἡ εἰρημένη, ὅτι ἐλύπησεν αὐτὸν καὶ συνέπεσε τῷ προσώπῳ· σημεῖον ἄρα ἔλαβε (?) τὴν λύπην μὴ τὰ ἀρέσκοντα θύων.

The recurrence of ἤρεσκεν and ἀρέσκοντα inclines us to think that ἠρέσθη, in Qu. 61, is after all not a corruption. In any case ἠρέσθη may be a paraphrase of πρόσσεσχεν, and in the absence of confirmation from other sources we cannot suppose that ἠρέσθη stood in Philo's LXX.

As to the reading ἐλύπησε for ἐλυπήθη, Holmes notes that ἐλύπησεν τὸν K. is read in x. 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 25, 31, 38, 55, 57, 59, 61, 64, 71, 73, 75, 76, 79, 82, 83, 106, 107, 108, 128, Compl., Ald., Alex., Cat., Nic. Bas. Sil. p. 23. Cyr. al. Glaph. p. 13. Chrys. iv. 158, et sic margo, 135. It is certain therefore that ἐλύπησε τὸν stood in Philo's LXX.; also that he read τῷ προσώπῳ and not τὸ πρόσωπον, which in many MSS. goes with ἐλύπησε.

Qu. 64.—Ch. iv. 7: Τί ἐστι, οὐκ ἐὰν ὀρθῶς μὴ προσενέγκης ἐὰν δὲ ὀρθῶς μὴ διέλῃς;

Qu. 65.—Ch. iv. 7: *Τί ἐστι· ἡμαρτες, ἡσύχασον*;

Putting these two titles together, we see that in Philo's LXX., οὐκ ἐὰν—*ἡμαρτες* was in any case not read as a question, and also that *μὴ* was added before *προσενέγκης*. In Philo D.A. i. 320, the citation appears thus: οὐκ ἐὰν ὀρθῶς προσενέγκης, ὀρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλῃς, but I suspect that the text has been conformed by the copyists. The reading of the Armenian title gives the same sense as the later reading, only better expressed. In Holmes' codd. 129, et sup. lin. 56, *μοι* is added before *προσενέγκης* and may be an echo of the older reading *μὴ*. The sentence is read positively and not interrogatively in Holmes codd. 31, 64, 106. Epiph. i. 493. Bas. ii. 328, 661. Latini pœne omnes.

The words *ἡμαρτες, ἡσύχασον* are made the matter of a new quæstio, and separated from what precedes. In Philo D. Sob. 1400, they are cited in same way: λέγεται γὰρ πρὸς τὸν φαῦλον “ὦ οὗτος, ἡμαρτες, ἡσύχασον.” We must conclude then that Philo read his LXX. as follows: οὐκ ἐὰν ὀρθῶς μὴ προσενέγκης, ὀρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλῃς, ἡμαρτες, ἡσύχασον.

Qu. 66.—Ch. iv. 7: *Διὰ τί τὸν καλὸν ἐγχειρίζειν τῷ πονηρῷ δοκεῖ, λέγων· Πρὸς σε ἡ ἀποστροφή αὐτοῦ*;

In the solutio are given also the words *σὺ ἄρξεις αὐτοῦ*.

Qu. 67.—Ch. iv. 8: *Διὰ τί ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἀποκτείνει*.

Qu. 68.—Ch. iv. 9: *Διὰ τί ὁ πάντα εἰδὼς ἐρωτᾷ τὸν ἀδελφοκτόνον ποῦ ἐστὶν Ἀβελ ὁ Ἀδελφός σου*;

Here the form Ἀβελ is again used.

Qu. 69.—Ch. iv. 9: *Διὰ τί ὡς περ ἀνὴρ ἀνθρώπῳ ἀποκρίνεται, λέγων· Οὐ γινώσκω, μὴ φύλαξ τῷ ἀδελφῷ μού εἰμι ἐγώ*;

The dative, τῷ ἀδελφῷ is given in one MS. of Holmes, 59. In Philo Q. D. P. I. i. 202, τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ is read; but I suspect that the copyists have conformed the reading, for in the solutio the dative is again implied: καὶ τίνι μᾶλλον ἔδει ἢ τῷ ἀδελφῷ φύλακα καὶ ὑπερασπιστήν γίνεσθαι; The Armenian Vulgate has τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ.

Qu. 70.—Ch. iv. 10: *Τί ἐστι φωνὴ αἵματος ἀδελφοῦ σου βοᾷ πρὸς με ἐκ γῆς*;

Here τοῦ is omitted before ἀδελφοῦ and τῆς before γῆς. I am not sure that the former omission stood in the Greek original of the Quaestio. In Philo Q. D. P. I. i. 205, 206, the verse is twice cited, both times giving τοῦ, but in one case omitting τῆς before γῆς. Therefore the omission of τῆς in the Armenian title may be more than a mere slip in rendering.

Qu. 71.—Ch. iv. 11: Διὰ τί κατάρματος γίνεται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; In spite of this title, I think that Philo read in his LXX. here ἀπό, and not ἐπὶ, for the following reasons:

1. The Armenian solutio loses its point unless ἀπό be read. I give it in Aucher's Latin: "Extrema mundi pars terra est; ista ergo maledicente aestimandum quod competentes maledictiones caetera quoque elementa ei obiciant Namque si inanimata terrenaque natura, iuga detrectans militat adversus iniuriam, cur non potiore iure mundiores naturae?" S. Ambrose also reproduces Philo's commentary thus: "Huiusmodi peccator a terra maledictus est, quae est infima et postrema pars mundi. Non est ergo dubium quod eum et superiora damnaverint, quem inferiora damnarunt."

2. Although in Philo Q. D. P. I. i. 210, the citation is given in the same way as in the Armenian title, viz.: καὶ νῦν ἐπικατάρματος σὺ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, yet the commentary which follows, κατάρματον δέ φησιν τὸν νοῦν, οὐκ ἀπ' ἄλλου τινος ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἔσεσθαι. Τῶν γὰρ χαλεπωτάτων αὐτοῦ συμφορῶν τὸ περὶ ἕκαστον ἡμῶν γεῶδες αἴτιον εὑρίσκεται κ. τ. λ. implies ἀπό rather than ἐπὶ, as Mangey remarked.

We must suppose that, both in the Armenian quaestio and in the Greek text of Philo i. 210 copyists have changed ἀπό into ἐπὶ. In the case of the quaestio in Genesin, the doubt remains whether the Greek text had been vitiated as early as 400 A.D., or whether it was the Armenian which was changed at a later date. The latter is most probable, for the Armenian Vulgate has ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, although κατάρματος is rendered by a different word. The Armenian title implies κατάρματος rather than ἐπικατάρματος, and as the

Greek Philo i. 210 (above cited) has *κατάρατος* in the Commentary, this was probably the reading of Philo's LXX.

Qu. 72.—Ch. iv. 12: *Τί ἐστι, στένων καὶ τρέμων ἔση ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* ;

Qu. 73.—Ch. iv. 13: *Τί ἐστι, μείζων ἡ αἰτία ἀφεθῆναί με* ; In Latin: *Maior ista causa dimitti me.*

In Philo Q. D. P. I. i. 218 is read: *μείζων ἡ αἰτία μου τοῦ ἀφεθῆναι*. In i. 430 it is again cited, adding *με* after *ἀφεθῆναι*, where also the subjoined commentary implies that Philo read *με* in his LXX. At i. 218 also Philo comments thus: *πόση τινι χρήσεσθαι κακοπραγία τοὺς ὑπὸ θεοῦ καταλειφθέντας γνωρίζομεν*, implying that there also he read *με* after *ἀφεθῆναι*, and removes the contradiction which there seemed to be between the verse as cited in i. 218 and in the Armenian quaestio. I believe that Philo omitted *τοῦ* before *ἀφεθῆναι*, otherwise his commentary, both in the Armenian solutio and in the passage i. 218, loses its point. The drift of that commentary is that to be abandoned by God is the worst of fates. Cp. i. 218, l. 45: *συνόλως γὰρ εἰδέναι χρή, ὅτι ὁ πρὸς τοῦ κρείττονος καὶ ὠφελούντος ἀφεθείς, ἐν αἰτίαις καὶ ἐγκλήμασι μεγίστοις γίνεται . . . Διό μοι δοκοῦσιν οἱ μὴ τελείως δυσκάθαρτοι, εὔξασθαι ἄν κολασθῆναι μᾶλλον ἢ ἀφεθῆναι*. The Armenian solutio is the same in tenour: "Profecto nulla est aerumna maior, quam quum derelinquat et despiciat Deus . . . despici vero a magno rege, et decidere ut abiectus ex regimine principatus, inenarrabilis miseria est" (Aucher's version).

Philo then seems to have taken the verse in this sense: "Thy sentence, that I should be abandoned, is too great." Whereas Tischendorf's text can only mean: "My fault is too great for me to be let off and acquitted." But how did Philo get this sense out of *αἰτία*, which = accusation, *not* sentence? Altogether the passage is a perplexing one. In the Armenian MS. of the Quaestiones a later hand gives in the margin the common reading, *μείζων ἡ αἰτία τοῦ ἀφεθῆναι με*. The Armenian Vulgate has *μείζων ἡ ζημία μου τοῦ ἀφεθῆναι με*, and an old Armenian commentator on Philo

so reads in this particular quaestio. Is it possible that Philo read in his LXX.: *μείζων ἢ ζημία ἀφεθῆναί με*, or that *ζημία* stood against *αἰτία* in the margin? The words quoted above from i. 218, *ἐν αἰτίαις καὶ ἐγκλήμασι μεγίστοις*, imply that Philo read *αἰτία*; while yet *ζημία* also seems to be implied by the following comment, also from i. 218: *σῶμα μὲν ἀπουσία ψυχῆς, ψυχὴ δὲ ἀπουσία λογισμοῦ, λογισμὸς δὲ ἐνδεία ἀρετῆς πέφυκε παραπολέσθαι. Εἰ δὲ ἕκαστον ὧν εἶπον ζημία τοῖς ἀπολειφθεῖσι γίνεται παρ' αὐτῶν, πόσῃ τινι χρῆσθαι κακοπραγία τοὺς ὑπὸ θεοῦ καταλειφθέντας γνωρίζομεν οὕς ἀποστραφεῖς . . . ἐξώρισεν κ.τ.λ.* Ambrose paraphrases the solutio of Qu. 73 in the same sense: "Nihil enim gravius quam errantem a Deo deseri." Such a sense would hardly suit the ordinary reading, *τοῦ ἀφεθῆναί με*, unless *ζημία* be read for *ἢ αἰτία*, and the whole clause be read as a question: *μείζων ζημία τοῦ ἀφεθῆναι με*; = "Is there a greater penalty than to be cast off?"

Qu. 74.—Ch. iv. 14: *Τί ἐστι, πᾶς ὁ εὐρίσκων με ἀποκτενεῖ με. ἐπείγε οὐκ ἦν ἄλλος ἄνθρωπος πλὴν τοὺς γονεῖς αὐτοῦ*;

Qu. 75.—Ch. iv. 15: *Διὰ τί πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνας Κάιν ἐπτά ἐκδικούμενα παραλύσει*;

Qu. 76.—Ch. iv. 15: *Διὰ τί σημεῖον τίθεται τῷ ἀδελφοκτόνῳ τοῦ μὴ ἀνελεῖν αὐτὸν πάντα τὸν εὐρίσκοντα, ἐπεὶ γε ἔδει ἐξ ἐναντίας ποιεῖν, ἐγχειρίζειν εἰς ἀπώλειαν*;

Here *αὐτὸν* is omitted after *εὐρίσκοντα*. So also in Philo i. 224 and i. 555. It may be inferred that *αὐτὸν* was absent from Philo's LXX.

Qu. 77.—Ch. iv. 23: *Διὰ τί Λάμεχ μετὰ πέντε γενέας ἑαυτὸν καταγινώσκει τοῦ προγόνου αὐτοῦ περὶ τοῦ Κάιν ἀδελφοκτονίαν. εἶπε γάρ φησι ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ γυναιξίν, 'Αδδὰ καὶ Σελλὰ. ἀνδρὰ ἀπέκτεινα εἰς τραῦμα καὶ νεανίσκον ἐμοὶ εἰς μῶλωπα. ὅτι ἐπτάκις ἐκδεδίκηται ἐκ Κάιν, ἐκ δὲ Λάμεχ ἐβδoμηκοντάκις ἐπτά*;

In Philo i. 201, the citation again occurs, and is made conformably to the text of Tischendorf: *εἰς τραῦμα ἐμοὶ καὶ νεαν. εἰς μῶλ. ἐμοί*, and punctuates before *'Αδὰ καὶ Σελλὰ* instead of after.

Holmes notes: 'Αδὰ καὶ Σελλά in casu dativo 20, 56. Cyr. al. Glaph. p. 22. Arm. ed. post Σελλά plene distinguunt 31, 37, 61. Compl. Alex.

The spelling 'Αδδὰ is retained in Armenian Vulgate, also in Armenian version of Philo's Interpretatio Nom Hebr.

Qu. 78.—Ch. iv. 25: Διὰ τί Ἀδὰμ γεννήσας τὸν Σῆθ ἐπιφημίζει· ἐξανέστησέ μοι ὁ θεὸς σπέρμα ἕτερον ἀντὶ Ἀβελ. ὃν ἀπέκτεινε Κάιν ;

Qu. 79.—Ch. iv. 26: Διὰ τί ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Σῆθ ὁ Ἐνὼς ἠλπισεν ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα Κύριον τοῦ Θεοῦ ;

Qu. 80.—Ch. v. 1: Διὰ τί μετὰ τὸ ἐλπίζειν φησί· αὕτη βίβλος γενέσεως ἀνθρώπων ; [Here ἡ is omitted before βίβλος as also in Philo i. 218. It is therefore probable that ἡ was omitted in Philo's LXX.]

Qu. 81.—Ch. v. 3: Διὰ τί ἐν τῇ γενεαλογίᾳ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ οὐκέτι μέμνηται τοῦ Κάιν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ Σῆθ, ὃν φησι Κατὰ τὴν ἰδέαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα γίνεσθαι, ἀφ' οὗ τὰς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ γενέας, ἄρχεται γενεαλογεῖν ;

Qu. 82.—Ch. v. 22: Διὰ τί, εὐηρέστησεν Ἐνὼχ τῷ θεῷ μετὰ τὸ γεννῆσαι τὸν Μαθουσάλα ἔτη διακόσια ;

Here αὐτὸν is omitted after γεννῆσαι and διακόσια ἔτη transposed. Holmes notes thus: omit αὐτὸν Eus. ii. 33: and ἔτη δ. is read in 15, 16, 18, 19, 37, 56, 61, 64, 108, 129, 131. Compl. Orig. iv. 310. Chrys. iv. 186. Slav. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed.

Qu. 83.—Ch. v. 21, 22: Διὰ τί ὁ μεταμεληθεὶς Ἐνὼχ πρὸ τῆς μεταμελείας λέγεται ζῆσαι ἔτη ἑκατὸν ἐξήκοντα καὶ πέντε, μετὰ δὲ τὴν μεταμέλειαν διακόσια ;

Here ἔτη ἑκατὸν ἐξήκοντα πέντε is read in (Holmes) 15, 18, 19, 20, 37, 56, 59, 64, 76, 82, 108, 129, 134. Compl. Chrys. iv. 186. Slav. et sic cum præmisso et ante quinque Arm. 1. Arm. Ed. (Holmes). Philo then in his LXX. must have so read.

Qu. 84.—Ch. v. 29: Διὰ τί εὐθύς ἐπὶ γεννηθέντι τῷ Νῶε ὁ πατὴρ εἶπεν οὗτος διαναπαύσει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν λυπῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἀπὸ ἧς κατηράσατο Κύριος ὁ Θεός ;

In Philo i. 214, ἡμῶν is supplied after ἔργων. The omission

of τῶν χειρῶν ἡμῶν is due to title. In i. 215 ἀπὸ is not given before ἡς, but compare Ch. iv. 11, ἐπικατάρατος σὺ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. It is probable that Philo read ἀπὸ here in his LXX.

Qu. 88.—Ch. vi. 1: *Τίνες εἰσι τοῦ Νῶε τρεῖς υἱοί, Σήμ, Χάμ, 'Ιάφεθ;*

Qu. 89.—Ch. vi. 1: *Διὰ τί ἀφ' οὗ ἐπλησίαζεν ὁ κατακλυσμὸς πλεονάζειν λέγεται τὸ ἀνθρώπων γένος;*

Qu. 90.—Ch. vi. 3: *Τί ἐστίν, οὐ μὴ καταμείνη τὸ πνεῦμα μου ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς σάρκας;*

Here *τούτοις* is omitted after ἀνθρώποις. So also in Philo i. 265. I infer that it was absent from his copy of the LXX.

In the solutio is cited Exod. xxxi. 3, as follows: *ἐνέπλησα αὐτὸν θείου πνεύματος σοφίας καὶ συνέσεως*, where Tischendorf has *πνεῦμα θεῖον*; but since Philo i. 265 has *πνεύματος θείου*, it is certain that he so read in his LXX.

Qu. 91.—Ch. vi. 3: *Διὰ τί αἱ ἡμέραι ἀνδρῶν (or ἀνθρώπων) ἔσονται ἔτη ἑκατὸν καὶ εἴκοσι;*

Here Tischendorf has *ἔσ. δὲ αἱ ἡ. αὐτῶν, ἑκατὸν εἴκοσιν ἔτη*; The verse is cited in Philo i. 270, as follows: *Ἔσονται αἱ ἡ. αὐτῶν ἔτη ἑκατὸν εἴκοσιν*. The order *ἔτη ἐκ. εἴκ.* is also found (Holmes) in 56, 76, 129, 134. Chrys. iv. 197, Theodoret i. 58, Slav. Arm. I. Arm. Ed. We may infer that Philo read *ἔτη ἐκ. εἴκ.* in his copy of the LXX.

Qu. 92.—Ch. vi. 4: *Διὰ τί ἐξ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐκ γυναικῶν οἱ γίγαντες;*

Tischendorf reads in vi. 4, *οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ*, instead of *ἄγγελοι*. But in Philo i. 272, *οἱ ἄγγελοι* is read. It is quite certain, therefore, that Philo's LXX. had *οἱ ἄγγελοι*. In the Arm. solutio of this quaestio we read: *καλεῖ δε ἐνίστε τοὺς ἀγγέλους θεοῦ υἱοὺς, ὅτι ἐγένοντο ἐξ οὐδενὸς θνητοῦ ἀθάνατοι*. Perhaps, therefore, *θεοῦ υἱοὶ* was written against *ἄγγελοι* in the margin of Philo's LXX., and eventually supplanted that older reading in MSS. of a later age.

Qu. 93.—Ch. vi. 6: *Τί ἐστίν ἐνεθυμήθη ὅτι ἐποίησε τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ διενεόθη;*

Tischendorf reads, *καὶ ἐνεθυμήθη ὁ θεὸς ὅτι κ. τ. λ.* Thus *καὶ* is omitted in the lemma: it is also omitted in Philo i. 275, and seems to have been absent in Philo's LXX. Perhaps ὁ θεὸς was also absent, and was replaced in Philo i. 275 by a copyist.

Qu. 94. — Ch. vi. 7: *Διὰ τί, ἀπειλήσας τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀπαλείψειν, καὶ τὰ κτήνη σὺν αὐτῷ ἀπολέσαι ἂν φησί. ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου γὰρ ἕως κτήνους καὶ ἀπὸ ἐρπετῶν ἕως πετεινῶν. τί γὰρ ἤμαρτε τὰ κτήνη ;*

Here *τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* is omitted after *πετεινῶν*, by citation merely, as it seems, for in Philo i. 280 it is added. Conversely, *καὶ* before *ἀπὸ ἐρπ.*, which is omitted in i. 280, is supplied in the Armenian title.

Qu. 95.—Ch. vi. 7: *Διὰ τί φησι ἐθυμώθη ὅτι ἐποίησα αὐτοὺς ;*

The Armenian commentary runs thus: *τὸ πρῶτον μὲν πάλιν ὡς ἄνθρωπον ἱστορεῖ ὡς ἐν κεφαλαίῳ. ἀλλ' ὅμως κυρίως ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ὀργίζεται, ἀλλὰ κρείσσων πάντων τῶν παθῶν.* This in itself proves that Philo read in his LXX. *ἐθυμώθην*, and not *ἐνεθυμήθην*, which Tischendorf retains. Holmes notes that *ἐθυμώθην* is read in I. 37, 71, 131. Alex. Philo in duobus MSS. i. 280, et alibi. Aug. Amb. Arab. 1, 2, et sic Arm. Ed. Philo's Greek commentary i. 280 also confirms *ἐθυμώθην*, viz.: *πάλιν τινὲς τῶν εἰρημένων ἀκούσαντες ὑπολαμβάνουσι θυμοῖς καὶ ὀργαῖς χρῆσθαι τὸ ὄν.* In Philo i. 283 *ἐθυμώθην* is given.

Qu. 96.—Ch. vi. 8: *Διὰ τί νῦν Νῶε φησι χάριν εὐρεῖν παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ;*

Here Tischendorf has *εὔρε χάριν ἐναντίον Κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ.* In Philo i. 102, the quaestio is propounded thus: *διὰ τί φησι τὸν Νῶε χάριν εὐρεῖν ἐναντίον Κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ;* but just below, in the same context, we read: *χάριν εὐρεῖν παρὰ θεῷ.* In i. 288, also we read: *Τί δέ ἐστι τὸ Νῶε εὔρε χάριν παρὰ Κυρίῳ θεῷ,* and in same context: *πηλίκον γὰρ τινα εἰκὸς γενέσθαι τὸν ἄξιον χάριτος κριθησόμενον παρὰ θεῷ.* In i. 284 we read: *διὸ νῦν φησὶ τὸν Νῶε χάριν εὐρεῖν παρ' αὐτῷ (τῷ θεῷ), ὅτε οἱ ἄλλοι φανέντες ἀχάριστοι τίνειν μέλλουσι δίκας.*

Lastly, in i. 285 is read: *Νῶε εὔρε χ. ἐναντίον Κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ*. The MSS. of the LXX. give no hint of a reading = *χάριν εὔρε παρὰ τῷ θεῷ*, though there is good ground for supposing that Philo so read in his LXX. The MSS. of Philo need to be re-examined at i. 102, i. 288, and i. 285.

Qu. 97.—Ch. vi. 9: *Διὰ τὸ γενεαλογῶν τὸν Νῶε οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν προγόνων ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρετῶν*;

And in solutio = *δίκαιος ἦν, τέλειος, εὐαρεστῶν*.

Qu. 98.—Ch. vi. 11: *Τί ἐστὶν ἐφθάρη ἡ γῆ ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἐπλήσθη ἡ γῆ ἀδικίας*;

Qu. 99.—Ch. vi. 12: *Τί ἐστι, κατέφθειρε πᾶσα σὰρξ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*;

Qu. 100.—Ch. vi. 13: *Τί ἐστι, καιρὸς παντὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦκε ἐναντίον μου, ὅτι ἐπλήσθη ἡ γῆ ἀδικίας*;

Here omission of *ἀπ' αὐτῶν* after *ἀδικίας* may be due to title.

In the solutio Num. xiv. 9 is cited thus: *ἀφέστηκεν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ καιρὸς, ὁ δὲ Κύριος ἐν ἡμῖν*. But in Philo i. 248, 618., the words run in the usual order: *ἀφ. ὁ καιρὸς ἀπ' αὐτ. κ. τ. λ.*, in which form they are found also in Procopius, who cites Philo's solutio 292 A (*vide* Paul Wendland, *Neue Entdeckte Fragmente Philos*).

QUAESTIONUM ET SOLUTIONUM IN GENESIN.

SERMO II.

Qu. 1.—*Τί ἐστὶν ἡ κατασκευή τοῦ Νῶε*;

Qu. 2.—Ch. vi. 14: *Διὰ τί ἐκ τετραγόνων ξύλων τὴν κιβωτὸν ποιεῖ*;

Qu. 3.—Ch. vi. 14: *Διὰ τί φησι νοσσιὰς νοσσιὰς ποιήσεις τὴν κιβωτόν*;

Was *νοσσιὰς* repeated in Philo's LXX., or is it a mere device of rendering? The Armenian Vulgate uses a different word to render *νοσσιὰς*, but agrees in repeating it. The old Latin versions, also some Greek codd., have *εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν*, where *εἰς* is due to *ποιήσεις* preceding.

Qu. 4.—Ch. vi. 14: *Διὰ τί κελεύει ἔσθωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν τὴν κιβωτὸν ἀσφαλτοῦν* ;

Qu. 5.—Ch. vi. 15: *Διὰ τί τὰ τῆς κιβωτοῦ ἀπέδωκε τὰ μέτρα ταῦτα· μῆκος τριακοσίων πήχεων, καὶ πλάτος αὐτῆς πεντήκοντα καὶ τὸ βάθος τριάκοντα ; καὶ εἰς πῆχυν ἄνωθεν συντελέσας, κατὰ σμικρὸν ἐπισυνάγων βάσεως τρόπον* ;

It is impossible to say for certain if any of these differences were in Philo's LXX., or whether they are not all due to title ; τό before *μῆκος* is absent in Holmes's Cod. I., and in Clem. Alex. Str. vi., 783, *βάθος* is read. It is certain, therefore, that Philo's copy of the LXX. had *βάθος* for *ὑψος*. The other variations are due probably to citation only.

Qu. 6.—Ch. vi. 16: *Τί ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκ πλαγίων θύρα· φησὶ γαρ, τὴν θύραν ποιήσεις ἐκ πλαγίων* ;

Here *τῆς κιβωτοῦ* is omitted after *θύραν*. The same omission occurs in Holmes's MSS. 15, 18, 19, 20, 37, 61, 82, 106, 108. Compl. Chrys. iv. 221. We may infer that *τῆς κιβωτοῦ* was omitted in Philo's LXX.

Qu. 7.—Ch. vi. 16: *Διὰ τί φησι κατὰ γαῖα διώροφα καὶ τριώροφα γίνεσθαι* ;

Qu. 8.—Ch. vi. 17: *Διὰ τί φησι κατακλυσμὸν γίνεσθαι καταφθεῖραι πᾶσαν σάρκα ἐν ᾗ ἐστὶ πνεῦμα ζῶν ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* ;

In the Armenian Commentary on Genesis, *κατακλυσμός* is always used, *κατακλυσμὸς ὕδωρ* never. Did, then, Philo's LXX. omit *ὕδωρ* after *κατακλυσμὸν* ? Probably it did, for in the New Testament, in Matt. xxiv. 38, Luke xvii. 27, 2 Pet. ii. 5, iii. 6, *ὕδωρ* is similarly omitted. Also *ζῶν*, for *ζωῆς*, is hardly an accident of citation, for the Armenian Vulgate implies *ζῶν* here.

Qu. 9.—Ch. vi. 17: *Διὰ τί ὅσα ἂν ᾗ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τελευτήσῃ, φησί· τί γὰρ ἀμαρτάνει τὰ ἄλογα* ;

Qu. 10.—Ch. vi. 18: *Τί ἐστὶ, στήσω τὴν διαθήκην μου πρὸς σε* ;

Here *πρὸς σε* is read for *μετὰ σοῦ*. Holmes notes that
VOL. V. R

πρός σε is read in X. 31, 38, 55, 56, 64, 68, 120, 121, 129, 131, 135. Ald. Alex. Ambr.

The agreement of these codd. with the title of the quaestio would sufficiently prove that Philo, in his copy of the LXX. read *πρός σε*, did not the Armenian solutio show beyond a doubt that he read *σε* without any preposition at all. His solutio ends thus: *δεύτερον δέ, πλείονά τινα χαρίζεται τῷ ἀστείῳ κληρονομίαν· οὐ γάρ φησι, στήσω τὴν διαθήκην σοι, ἀλλὰ σε· τὸ δὲ ἐστὶ, σὺ εἰ δικαία καὶ ἀληθὴς διαθήκη, ἣν βεβαιώσω τῷ λογικῷ γένει πρὸς κτήσιν τε καὶ πρὸς εὐπρέπειαν, οἷς ἀρετὴ χρησίμη;*

In S. Ambr. de Noe et Arca, c. x. n. 35, this part of the solutio is thus paraphrased: "Multum autem tribuit iusto, dicendo: statuam testamentum meum ad te; eo quod rationalis et fidelis vir sit testamentum Dei. Ipse est enim hereditas, ipse possessio, in quo virtus divini testamenti est." Must we not conclude that in Ambrose's citation a copyist has added *ad* before *te*, and that the Armenian citation has been similarly conformed? The Armenian Vulgate implies rather *μετά σου* than *πρός σε*, and is otherwise quite independent of this Philonean citation. Perhaps the Greek text of Philo had already been conformed before the Armenian version was made. In any case, if Philo's LXX. had neither *πρός σε* nor *μετά σου*, but only *σε*, the conflict of readings in MSS. of the LXX. of a later date is explained.

Qu. 11.—Ch. vii. 1: *Διὰ τί λέγει· εἰσελθε σὺ καὶ πᾶς ὁ οἶκός σου εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν, ὅτι σε εἶδον δίκαιον ἐναντίον ἐμοῦ ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ;*

Here our LXX. prefaces thus: *Καὶ εἶπε Κύριος ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Νῶε, Εἰσελθε, κ.τ.λ.* The omission of *Κύριος ὁ θεὸς πρὸς Νῶε* may be due to title, but see on Qu. 5, 6, Ch. ix. 1.

I have read *ἐμοῦ* here rather than *μου*, because that is the reading of the title as preserved in Procopius (see Paul Wendland, *Neu Entdeckte Fragmente Philos*, p. 48); *ἐμοῦ* is read in Holmes's MSS. x., 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 25, 32, 37, 55,

56, 58, 64, 73, 75, 77, 78, 130, 131, 134, 135. Compl. Cat. Nic. Chrys., iv. 230.

Qu. 12.—Ch. vii. 2: *Διὰ τί εἰς τὴν κιβωτὸν κελεύει εἰσελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν καθαρῶν κτηνῶν ἑπτὰ ἄρρεν καὶ θῆλυ, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν μὴ καθαρῶν δύο ἄρρεν καὶ θῆλυ, διαθρέψαι σπέρμα ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ;*

Tischendorf has *ἑπτὰ, ἑπτὰ* and *δύο δύο*. In Philo Q. D. P. I., i. 223, is the following citation: *εἰσαγαγεῖν εἰς τὴν κιβωτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν κτηνῶν τῶν καθαρῶν ἑπτὰ ἄρρεν καὶ θῆλυ*, which makes it probable that Philo's LXX. did not repeat *ἑπτὰ* and *δύο*. But the difference may be due to citation, as also may be the changed order, *τῶν καθ. κτ.* for *τῶν κτ. τῶν καθαρῶν*, and the omission of *τῶν κτηνῶν* before *τῶν μὴ καθαρῶν*. The other differences are less easily explained. (i.) Why are the words of verse 3, *καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ—ἄρρεν καὶ θῆλυ*, omitted, and (ii.) *εἰς τὴν κιβωτὸν* used instead of *πρὸς σέ*?

i. No other authority omits the words *καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πετ. κ.τ.λ.*, and in absence of other authority we must regard this omission as due to exigencies of citation.

ii. *εἰς τὴν κιβωτὸν* for *πρὸς σέ*, has support of Q. D. P. I., i. 223, where we read thus: *παραινεί τῷ φανέντι δικαίῳ . . . εἰσαγαγεῖν εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν, ὅπερ ἦν τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγγεῖον, τὸ σῶμα, ἀπὸ τῶν κτηνῶν κ. τ. λ.* We may almost infer that Philo, in his LXX., read *εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν*, instead of *πρὸς σέ*.

Qu. 13.—Ch. vii. 4: *Διὰ τί μετὰ τὸ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν κιβωτὸν ἑπτὰ ἡμέραι διήλθον, μεθ' ὃ ὁ κατακλυσμός ;*

Qu. 14.—Ch. vii. 4: *Διὰ τί ὁ ὑετὸς τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ γίνεται εἰς τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ εἰς παραπλησίας νύκτας ;*

τὸν ὑετὸν, implied in above title, is read in Holmes's MS. 37. Philo probably read τὸν ὑ. in his LXX. It is also probable that he added τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ, for in Copt. Arab. 3, *aquam diluvii* is implied. In the solutio is given: *εἰς τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας*.

Qu. 15.—Ch. vii. 4: *Τί ἐστίν, ἐξαλείψω πᾶσαν τὴν ἐξανάστασιν ἣν ἐποίησα ἀπὸ προσώπου (? τῆς) γῆς ;*

This title is also preserved in the original Greek. (See

Rendell Harris, *Fragments of Philo*, p. 21, and Paul Wendland, p. 54.) Procopius cites ἀνάστασιν for ἐξανάστασιν. The Armenian version does not make it certain which was read in its original, though it proves that one or the other was read. Philo himself, therefore, in his LXX., read either ἀνάστασιν or ἐξανάστασιν ἦν, and not ἀνάστημα ὃ; his commentary in itself proves that he had this reading: διὸ καὶ ἀνάστασιν φησιν· ἀναστάσει δὲ ἀντίπαλον καθαίρεισι. (Paul Wendland, p. 54.) The same reading is found (Holmes) in I., 55, 71. Slav. Sahid. 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 25, 32, 37, 38, 57, 59, 61, 72, 74, 76, 79, 82, 106, 107, 108, 127, 128, 130, 131, 134, 135. Compl. Orig. iv. 112. Chrys. iv. 226, 227, 230. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed.

In the title πάσης is omitted after προσώπου. So also in the original Greek of quaestio in R. Harris, *l.c.* πάσης is omitted (Holmes) in 15, 19, 20, 37, 38, 55, 56, 58, 61, 64, 76, 82, 107, 108, 129, 134, 135. Compl. Alex. Chrys. iv., 226, 227, 230. Ambr. Copt. Arab. 1, 3. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed. It is certain, then, that πάσης was absent in Philo's LXX.

Qu. 16.—Ch. vii. 5: Διὰ τί φησιν· ἐποίησε Νῶε πάντα ὅσα ἐνετείλατο αὐτῷ Κύριος ὁ θεός;

Qu. 17.—Ch. vii. 11: Διὰ τί ἐν τῷ ἐξακοσιοστῷ τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Νῶε γίνεται ὁ κατάκλυσμος ἐν τῷ ἐβδόμῳ μηνί· εἰκάδι καὶ ἐβδόμη τοῦ μηνός.

Here (i.) ἔτει is omitted after ἐξακοσιοστῷ—an omission found in no other source, and probably due to title; (ii.) τῆς ζωῆς, for ἐν τῇ ζωῇ, is implied by the rendering *vitae* in Copt. Slav. Ostrog. Arm. 1, 2. Arm. Ed. Philo, therefore, read τῆς ζωῆς. (See below, Qu. 45, on Gen. viii. 13.) (iii.) ἐν τῇ ἐβδόμῳ μηνί, for τοῦ δευτέρου μηνός. The form of the citation, ἐν τῇ ἐ. μηνί, may be due to title, but it is certain that Philo, in his LXX., read either ἐβδόμῳ or ἐβδόμου, and not δευτέρου. For not only does the Armenian commentary repeat the former, but Ambrose, in his paraphrase of that commentary, writes as follows (De Noe et Arca, c. xiv.): Septimum mensem verni esse temporis non ambigitur. . . . Tunc ergo fecit diluvium." (iv.) εἰκ. καὶ

ἐβ., for ἐβδόμη καὶ εἰκάδι. The commentary agrees with the title in this order, εἰκ. κ. ἐβ.; which we must therefore infer was the order of the words in Philo's LXX.

Qu. 18.—Ch. vii. 11: *Τί ἐστίν, ἐρράγησαν πᾶσαι αἱ πηγαὶ τῆς ἀβύσσου καὶ οἱ καταρράκται τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀνεῴχθησαν*;

There is a diversity of readings in the Armenian title, the one reading being = *καταρράκται*, the other = *καταρροαί*. The same diversity of reading reflects itself also in the Armenian solutio.

Qu. 19.—Ch. vii. 16: *Τί ἐστι, ἔκλεισεν ὁ θεὸς ἔξωθεν αὐτοῦ τὴν κιβωτόν*;

Here (i.) *Κύριος* is omitted before ὁ θεός. So in 76. Just M. Dial., p. 410. Chrys. in Cat. Nic. 147 (Holmes).

(ii.) The order ἔξ. αὐ. τ. κιβ., instead of τ. κιβ. ἔξ. αὐ., is found in X., 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 25, 31, 37, 38, 57, 58, 59, 61, 73, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 82, 106, 108, 128, 130, 131, 134, 135. Compl. Cat. Nic. Chrys. iv., 235, *et alibi*. Arm. 1, 2. Arm. Ed.

We may infer that Philo, in his LXX., read the verse as in the title.

Qu. 20.—Chap. vii. 17, 18: *Τί ἐστίν, ἐπληθύνθη τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ ἐπῆρε τὴν κιβωτόν, καὶ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος*;

Here there are omitted, after *κιβωτόν*, the words *καὶ ὑψώθη, κ. τ. λ.*, which we need not suppose were absent from Philo's LXX. Tischendorf has *ἐπεπληθύνθη*, against which the Armenian title is not decisive; it may only neglect the preposition *ἐπί*. We find *ἐπληθύνθη* in (Holmes) 14-16, 18-20, 38, 55-59, 61, 64, 71, 73, 75-79, 82, 106-108, 128, 130, 134. Compl. Alex. Cat. Nic. Chrys., iv., 239.

Qu. 21.—Ch. vii. 20: *Διὰ τί πεντεκαίδεκα πῆχεις ὑπεράνω (rather ἐπάνω) πάντα τὰ ὑψηλὰ ὄρη ἐπλεόναζε*;

Here Tischendorf has *πεντ. π. ὑπεράνω ὑψώθη τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ ἐπεκάλυψε πάντα τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλά*.

Perhaps *ἐπέκλυζε* lurks behind the word which I render *ἐπλεόναζε*. Nothing can be inferred from this mutilated citation as to the text of Philo's LXX. In (Holmes) 20 Chrys. iv. 139, *ἐπέκλυzen* is read. The Armenian solutio

contains the words: αὐται αἱ πεντεκαίδεκα πῆχεις, αἱ ὑπεράνω ἦσαν κατακλύζονται γὰρ καὶ αὐται (or οὗτοι). This suggests ἐπέκλυζεν. Ambrose in his paraphrase writes: "Excelsi montes qui hanc carnem passionem obumbrant;" and Aucher, following him, writes: "Montes enim altiores in corpore nostro obumbrant sensus," where the sense of the Armenian is: ὅτι ὑψηλὰ ὄρη κατὰ τὸ σῶμα ἡμῶν αἰνίττεται αἰσθήσεις.

Qu. 22.—Ch. vii. 21: Τί ἐστίν, ἀπέθανε πᾶσα σὰρξ κινουμένη;

Qu. 23.—Ch. vii. 22: Τί ἐστι, πᾶν ὅσον (or πάντα ὅσα) ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς ξηρᾶς ἀπέθανε;

Here ὅσον is read for ὅ. The uncial and other MSS. waver between πᾶν ὃ and πᾶς ὅς, the latter being read in those sources which usually agree with Philo. Perhaps πάνθ' ὅς ἦν was the original reading.

Qu. 24.—Ch. vii. 23: Τί ἐστίν, ἐξήλειψε πᾶσαν ἀνάστασιν ἣ ἦν ἐπὶ προσώπου τῆς γῆς;

Here πᾶσαν ἀνάστασιν ἣ is read for πᾶν τὸ ἀνάστημα ὃ. We saw that in Qu. 15 ἀνάστασιν was similarly read. In this passage (ch. vii. 23) the older reading, ἀνάστασιν, which Philo had in his LXX., has disappeared from all the Greek MSS. of the LXX. without exception.

Qu. 25.—Ch. vii. 23: Τί ἐστι, κατελείφθη μόνος Νῶε καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ κιβωτῷ;

Qu. 26.—Ch. viii. 1: Διὰ τί φησιν, ἐμνήσθη ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Νῶε καὶ τῶν θηρίων καὶ τῶν κτηνῶν, τῆς δὲ γυναικὸς καὶ τῶν τέκνων οὐκ ἀνεμνήσθη;

Here (i.) πάντων is omitted twice before τῶν θηρίων and τῶν κτηνῶν. (ii.) ἐμνήσθη for ἀνεμνήσθη. The Armenian title would not in itself be decisive for ἐμνήσθη, did not Procopius (P. Wendland, p. 56) cite this title of Philo's as follows: πῶς δὲ τοῦ Νῶε μνησθεὶς ὁ θεὸς καὶ κτηνῶν καὶ θηρίων, γυναικὸς ἢ τέκνων οὐ μέμνηται; Also (P. Wendland, p. 106) Theodoret, imitating Philo, quotes thus: ἐμνήσθη Κύριος τοῦ Νῶε. Furthermore ἐμνήσθη is read (Holmes) i. I., X., 15, 16, 18, 25, 31, 32, 37, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 64, 6

73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 82, 106, 120, 121, 129, 131, 134, 135. Ald. Alex. Cat. Nic. Chrys. iv., 246, *et saepe*.

It is therefore certain that in Philo's LXX. ἐμνήσθη stood. The first πάντων is omitted in Ambr. (Holmes); the second in 75, Ambr. (Holmes). We cannot safely infer that they were absent in Philo's LXX.

In the solutio of the same quaestio is cited the following from Isaiah, ch. li. 2: φησιν ὁ προφητῆς· ἐμβλέψατε εἰς Ἀβραὰμ τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ εἰς Σάρραν τὴν ὠδίνουσαν ὑμᾶς, an addition to the very scanty citations of Isaiah given in Philo.

Qu. 27.—Ch. viii. 1: Διὰ τί πρότερον τῶν θηρίων, ἔπειτα τῶν κτηνῶν ἀναμνησθεῖς, λέγων ὅτι ἐμνήσθη τοῦ Νῶε καὶ τῶν θηρίων καὶ τῶν κτηνῶν;

Here πάντων is again twice omitted, which strengthens the surmise that in Philo's LXX. the same omission occurred.

Qu. 28.—Ch. viii. 1: Τί ἐστίν, ἐπήγαγεν πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ ἐκόπασε τὸ ὕδωρ;

Here ὁ θεός is omitted after ἐπήγαγεν. Procopius (Wendland, p. 56) has preserved this quaestio in Greek thus: καὶ ἐπήγαγε πνεῦμα εἰς τὴν γῆν καὶ κεκόπακε τὸ ὕδωρ; where εἰς for ἐπὶ and κεκόπακε are singular, and are not confirmed by the Armenian or by any other authority. Procopius is not an independent authority for omission of ὁ θεός, which may be due to title; though, on the whole, it looks as if ὁ θεός was absent from Philo's LXX.

Qu. 29.—Ch. viii. 2: Τί ἐστίν, ἐπικαλύφθησαν αἱ πηγαὶ τῆς ἀβύσσου καὶ οἱ καταρράκται τοῦ οὐρανοῦ;

In the solutio the passage is again cited, where Procopius preserves the Greek (P. Wendland, p. 57), thus: μεθ' ἡμέρας γὰρ, φησιν, ρν' ἐπικαλυφθῆναι τὰς τε πηγὰς καὶ τοὺς καταρράκτας.

Qu. 30.—Ch. viii. 3: Τί ἐστίν ὅτι ἡλαττονοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ μετὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ πεντήκοντα ἡμέρας;

Procopius has preserved the Greek of the above (Wendland, p. 57), μετὰ ν' δὲ καὶ ρ' ἡμέρας ἡλαττοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ. It is impossible to say which the Armenian represents, whether

ἡλαττοῦτο or ἡλαττοῦτο. The order, ἐκατὸν πενήκοντα, which the Armenian probably implies in its original, is in following codd. (Holmes) : 16, 19, 20, 37, 38, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 64, 73, 75, 78, 106, 108, 129, 130. Compl. Chrys. iv., 248. Arab. 1. 2. 3. Slav. Georg. et sic sed interposito et, Arm. 1, 2. Arm. Edition.

Qu. 31.—Ch. viii. 3: Διὰ τί φησιν, ἐκάθισεν ἡ κιβωτὸς ἐν τῷ ἐβδόμῳ μηνὶ εἰκάδι καὶ ἐβδόμῃ τοῦ μηνὸς ;

Here (i.) τῷ ἐβδ. μ. is read for τῷ μ. τῷ ἐβδ. The same variant is in (Holmes) 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 25, 37, 38, 56, 57, 58, 61, 64, 73, 77, 78, 79, 106, 129, 130, 131. Compl. Cat. Nic. Chrys. iv., 248. Arm. 1. 2. Arm. Ed.

(ii.) εἰκάδι καὶ ἐβδόμῃ, for ἐβδ. κ. εἰκ. That this order is no device of rendering is certain, because it is found in the Cat. Barb. with the lemma, Φίλωνος ἐπισκόπου. The passage (*vide* P. Wendland, p. 49) is as follows: ἐβδόμῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ μηνὸς τοῦ δευτέρου ὁ κατακλυσμὸς ἄρχεται καὶ εἰκάδι ἐβδόμῃ τοῦ ἐβδόμου μηνὸς ἐκάθισεν ἡ κιβωτὸς εἰς τὰ ὄρη. It may be inferred that εἰκάδι ἐβδόμῃ was read in Philo's LXX.

Qu. 32.—Ch. viii. 5: Διὰ τί φησι, ἐν τῷ δεκάτῳ μηνί, τῇ πρώτῃ ὥφθησαν αἱ κεφαλὴν τῶν ὀρέων ;

Here τοῦ μηνὸς is omitted after τῇ πρώτῃ. The omission is not shown in any other source, so it may be due to title.

Qu. 33.—Ch. viii. 6: Διὰ τί μετὰ τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας ἀνοίγει τὴν θυρίδα τῆς κιβωτοῦ ὁ δίκαιος ;

Here ὁ δίκαιος for Νῶε, which in Tischendorf's text follows ἡνέφξε, may be set down as a device of citation.

Qu. 34.—Ch. viii. 6: Τί ἐστι τῆς κιβωτοῦ θυρὶς ἣν ἀνοίγει ὁ δίκαιος ;

Qu. 35.—Ch. viii. 6: Διὰ τί τὸν κόρακα πρῶτον ἀπέστειλε ;

Here Tischendorf has ἀπέστειλε τὸν κόρακα. The variations may be ascribed to title. The Armenian solutio which follows makes it certain that Philo had not in his LXX. the words τοῦ ἰδεῖν εἰ κεκόπακεν τὸ ὕδωρ, which in so many codd. are added after κόρακα. See also Quaestio 38.

Qu. 36.—Ch. viii. 7: *Διὰ τί ἐξελθὼν ὁ κόραξ οὐκέτι ἀναστρέφει, ὅτι οὐπω ἦν μέρος τι γῆς ζηρανθέν* ;

Here *οὐκέτι* is confirmed by the Armenian Vulgate. The rest of the verse is cited in the usual form in next quaestio.

Qu. 37.—Ch. viii. 7: *Διὰ τί μετέβαλε λέγων, ἕως τοῦ ξηρανθῆναι τὸ ὕδωρ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. οὐ γὰρ ὕδωρ ἀπὸ γῆς, ἀλλὰ γῆ ἀφ' ὕδατος* ;

Qu. 38.—Ch. viii. 8: *Διὰ τί τὸ δεύτερον ἀποστέλλει τὴν περιστερὰν, καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰδεῖν εἰ κεκόπακε τὸ ὕδωρ, ὧν οὐδὲν περὶ τὸν κόρακα εἴρηται* ;

Here (i.) *παρ' αὐτοῦ* is read for *ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ*. The same variant is in (Holmes) 20, 61, 74, 106, 107, 129, 134. Chrys. iv. 249. It is certain that Philo read *παρ' αὐτοῦ* in his LXX., for the solutio of this quaestio repeats and explains the title. (ii.) *καὶ* is twice added, before *παρ' αὐτοῦ*, and before *ἰδεῖν*. This is due to citation only. (iii.) *ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς* is omitted after *ὕδωρ*, an omission which does not seem to be due to mere exigencies of citation, since in the solutio the citation is again made without these words being added.

Qu. 39.—Ch. viii. 9: *Διὰ τί οὐχ εὐρούσα ἡ περιστερὰ ἀνάπαυσιν τοῖς ποσὶν ἀναστρέφει πρὸς αὐτόν* ;

Here *αὐτῆς* is omitted after *ποσὶν*. No other source shows this omission, which I yet think was in Philo's LXX., because it accords with the greater terseness observable in many of his citations.

Qu. 40.—Ch. viii. 9: *Τί·ἐστίν, ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν καὶ εἰσήγαγεν πρὸς ἑαυτόν* ;

Here *αὐτὴν* is omitted after *εἰσήγαγεν* and *εἰς τὴν κιβωτὸν* after *ἑαυτόν*. Both omissions may be due to exigencies of citation.

Qu. 41.—Ch. viii. 10: *Διὰ τί ἐπισχὼν ἑπτὰ ἔτι ἐτέρας ἡμέρας, πάλιν ἐξαπέστειλε τὴν περιστερὰν* ;

Tischendorf has the order, *ἐπισχὼν ἔτι ἡμ. ἑπτὰ ἐτ. πάλιν*. One MS. of Holmes, 58, has the order, *ἑπτὰ ἐτέρας ἡμέρας*, and many more have *ἑπτὰ ἡμ.*, viz., 3, 15, 16, 19, 37,

64, 75, 82, 83, 106, 129, 130. Compl. Chrys. iv. 250. Georg. But none entirely agree with the title, which yet most probably represents the reading of Philo's LXX. The omission of *ἐκ τῆς κιβωτοῦ* must be ascribed to exigencies of citation.

Qu. 42.—Ch. viii. 11: *Τί ἐστιν, ἀνέστρεψε εἰς αὐτὸν ἡ περιστερὰ τὸ πρὸς ἐσπέραν ἔχουσα φύλλον ἐλαίας κάρφος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῆς;*

Here *ἔχουσα*, for *καὶ εἶχε*, may be a device of citation, or even of rendering. The original Greek of the title seems to have had *εἰς αὐτόν*, not *πρὸς αὐτόν*.

Qu. 43.—Ch. viii. 11: *Διὰ τί ἔγνω Νῶε ὅτι κεκόπακε τὸ, ὕδωρ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς;*

In the solutio is embedded a text of Isaiah, thus: *διὸ γινώριμος Μώσεως καὶ φίλος προφήτης τις ἐνομοθέτησε τοιόνδε τινα λόγον, εἰ μὴ ὁ Κύριος παντοκράτωρ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα ἐγενήθημεν ἂν ὡς τυφλοὶ καὶ στειωμένοι, οὔτε γιγνώσκουσιν τὸ καλὸν οὔτε γεννᾶν δυνάμενοι. τὴν δὲ τυφλότητα καὶ στείρωσιν τῇ πατρίᾳ γλώσσαι Χαλδαῖοι καλοῦσι Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα.*

This text, Isaiah i. 9, runs in Tischendorf's ed. thus: *καὶ εἰ μὴ Κύριος Σαβαὼθ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα, ὡς Σόδομα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν καὶ ὡς Γόμορρα ἂν ὁμοιωθώμεν.*

Qu. 44.—Ch. viii. 12: *Διὰ τί τὸ τρίτον μετὰ ἐτέρας ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας ἐξαπέστειλε τὴν περιστερὰν καὶ οὐκέτι ἐπέστρεψεν πρὸς αὐτόν;*

Tischendorf's text runs thus: *καὶ ἐπισχὼν ἔτι ἡμέρας ἑπτὰ ἐτέρας πάλιν ἐξαπέστειλε τὴν περιστερὰν, καὶ οὐ προσέθετο τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι πρὸς αὐτόν ἔτι.*

Here Philo's title has (i.): *τὸ τρίτον μετὰ*, for *ἐπισχὼν ἔτι*. This may be a device of citation.

(ii.) *ἐτέρας ἑπτὰ ἡμ.*, instead of *ἡμ. ἐπ. ἐτ.*

The order *ἑπτὰ ἡμ.* is found (Holmes) in X. 15, 16, 18, 25, 37, 38, 56, 57, 59, 61, 64, 75, 79, 82, 106, 128, 129, 130, 131. Compl. Cat. Nic. Chrys. iv. 250. Slav.

The same order presented itself in verse 10.

(iii.) *πάλιν* is omitted before *ἐξαπέστειλε*. It is also

omitted in Holmes 15, 58, 61, 64, 106, 107. Compl. Chrys. l. c.

(iv.) οὐκέτι ἐπέστρεψεν πρὸς αὐτὸν, for οὐ προσέθετο τοῦ ἐπιστρέφαι πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔτι.

The reading οὐκ ἀνέστρεψεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔτι is in (Holmes) 37; and (Holmes) 82 reads ἔτι after οὐ, omitting it after αὐτὸν. This agreement of the MSS. 37 and 82 is noteworthy.

I infer that variations (ii.), (iii.), and (iv.) stood in Philo's LXX.

Qu. 45.—Ch. viii. 13: Διὰ τί ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ καὶ ἑξακοσιοστῷ ἔτει τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Νῶε τοῦ πρώτου μιᾶ τοῦ μηνὸς ἐξέλιπεν τὸ ὕδωρ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς;

Here (i.) recurs τῆς ζωῆς, instead of ἐν τῇ ζωῇ.

(ii.) μηνὸς is omitted after πρώτου.

Of these it is certain that (i.) is not accidental, but stood in Philo's LXX., for it has occurred before in ch. vii. 11.

That (ii.) the omission of μηνὸς was in Philo's LXX. is proved by the solutio of above quaestio, which begins as follows: τὸ πρώτου κατ' ἑλλειψιν εἴρηται ἡ μηνὸς ἢ ἀνθρώπου καὶ λόγον ἔχει ἐκάτερον. εἰ γὰρ καὶ πρώτου μηνὸς (or πρώτῳ μηνὶ) ἀκουστέον ἐστὶ τὸ ἐκλείπειν τὸ ὕδωρ, νομιστέον τὸν ἑβδομον μηνὰ λαβεῖν φάναι, τὸν κατ' ἰσημερίαν. ὁ αὐτὸς γὰρ μὴν πρῶτος τέ ἐστι καὶ ἑβδομος. ὥσει πρῶτος μὲν φύσει καὶ δυνάμει, χρόνῳ δὲ ἑβδομος. ἐν ἄλλῳ δέ φησι τόπῳ (Exod. xii. 2): "ὁ μὴν οὗτος ὑμῖν ἀρχὴ μηνῶν· πρῶτός ἐστιν ἐν τοῖς μηνσὶ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ" Εἰ δὲ ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπου λέγεται τὸ πρῶτος κυριώτερον ῥηθήσεται. ὄντως γὰρ πρῶτος καὶ πάνν ἄγαθὸς ὁ δίκαιος κ.τ.λ.

In the citation of Exod. xii. 2 ὑμῖν is omitted after πρῶτος ἐστιν. In the Armenian commentary on Exodus (Auch. 2. 443) the citation recurs, again with this omission of ὑμῖν, which we may therefore infer was in Philo's LXX., though no other source confirms it.

Qu. 46.—Ch. viii. 13: Τί ἐστὶν ἀπεκάλυψε Νῶε τὴν στέγην τῆς κιβωτοῦ;

Qu. 47.—Ch. viii. 14: *Διὰ τί ἐν τῷ ἐβδόμῳ μηνὶ εἰκάδι καὶ ἐβδόμῃ ἐξηράνθη ἡ γῆ* ;

Here (i.) *ἐβδόμῳ* is read for *δευτέρῳ*.

(ii.) *ἐξ. ἡ γῆ* follows *μηνὶ* in Tischendorf's text.

(iii.) *τοῦ μηνὸς* is omitted after *ἐβδόμῃ*.

(iv.) *εἰκ. κ. ἐβδ.*, instead of *ἐβδ. κ. εἰκ.*

Tischendorf reads as follows: *ἐν δὲ τῷ δευτέρῳ μηνὶ ἐξηράνθη ἡ γῆ, ἐβδόμῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ μηνός*.

As to (i.), compare Quaestio 17 above. The Armenian solutio of this and of other quaestiones confirm it. Also the best MSS. of the Armenian Vulgate have *ἐβδόμῳ*, both here and in ch. vii. 11. There can be no doubt but that Philo's LXX. read *ἐβδόμῳ*, although none of Holmes' sources confirm it.

(ii.) This general order of words (but retaining *τοῦ μηνός*) is in (Holmes) I., X., 14, 16, 18, 25, 31, 55, 56, 68, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 79, 82, 83, 120, 121, 129, 131, 134. Ald. Alex. Cat. Nic. Ambr.

(iii.) This omission cannot safely be ascribed to Philo's LXX., for in the similar passage, Gen. vii. 11, *τοῦ μηνός* is retained.

(iv.) This variant was in Philo's LXX. Cp. Qu. 17 on Gen. vii. 11.

Qu. 48.—Ch. viii. 15, 16: *Διὰ τί ζηρανθείσης τῆς γῆς οὐκ ἐξέρχεται Νῶε ἐκ τῆς κιβωτοῦ πρὶν τοῦ λόγον ἀκούσαι· εἶπε γὰρ Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῷ Νῶε· ἔξελθε σὺ, καὶ ἡ γυνή σου, καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ σου καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες τῶν υἱῶν σου καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ζῶα* ;

This title is preserved in Greek in the Cat. Barb., and in Procopius (*see* Wendland, pp. 58 and 111), always omitting *ἐκ τῆς κιβωτοῦ* after *ἔξελθε*. These are not, of course, independent sources for this passage, yet I think Philo's LXX. omitted *ἐκ τῆς κιβωτοῦ*. The words *καὶ τὰ ἄ. ζ* seem to be a paraphrase of *καὶ πάντα τὰ θηρία*, in verse 17.

Qu. 49.—Ch. viii. 18: *Διὰ τί ὅτε εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν ἡ τάξις ἦν αὐτοῦ τε καὶ υἱῶν, ἔπειτα τῶν γυναικῶν αὐτοῦ τε καὶ τῶν υἱῶν ὅτε δὲ ἐξῆλθον, μεταβέβληται. ἐξελθεῖν γάρ*

φησι Νῶε καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα, ἔπειτα οἱ υἱοὶ καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες τῶν υἱῶν ;

The first part of this title is in accord with Gen. vii. 7, 8, and the latter part with Gen. viii. 18. The triple omission of αὐτοῦ after γυναῖκα, υἱοὶ and υἱῶν must, in default of other testimony, be attributed to title only.

Qu. 50.—Ch. viii. 20 : Διὰ τί ὠκοδόμησε θυσιαστήριον, οὐ κελευσθεῖς ;

Qu. 51.—Ch. viii. 20 : Διὰ τί τῷ θεῷ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, ἀλλ' οὐ τῷ Κυρίῳ λέγεται οἰκοδομεῖν ;

Tischendorf has τῷ Κυρίῳ. τῷ θεῷ is read in (Holmes) III., X., 14, 16, 18, 19, 25, 37, 38, 55-59, 64, 71-79, 82, 106-108, 128-131, 134. Compl. Alex. Cat. Nic. Chrys. iv., 257, Fulgent.

Thus Philo read here τῷ θεῷ in his LXX.

Qu. 52.—Ch. viii. 20 : Τί ἐστιν, ἔλαβεν ἀπὸ τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πετεινῶν τῶν καθαρῶν καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν ὀλοκαρπώσεις ;

Tischendorf reads : ἐλ. ἀπὸ πάντων τ. κτ. τῶν καθαρῶν καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν πετ. τ. καθ. καὶ ἀν. εἰς ὀλοκάρπωσιν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον.

The title (i.) omits πάντων twice, before τῶν κτ. and before τῶν πετ. : (ii.) it omits τῶν καθαρῶν after κτηνῶν : (iii.) it omits εἰς : and (iv.) has ὀλοκαρπώσεις for ὀλοκάρπωσιν. The title has the air of being a formal and full citation of the text, so all four of the above variants must have stood in Philo's LXX. The omissions accord with the terser, shorter character which, from other instances, we see his text of the LXX. must have had. ὀλοκαρπώσεις, instead of εἰς ὀλοκάρπωσιν, in X., 16, 18, 25, 38, 57, 71, 73, 74, 76, 77, 78, 128, 130, 131, 134. Cat. Nic. The preposition εἰς is omitted, though the singular ὀλοκάρπωσιν is retained in VI., 14, 15, 19, 37, 55, 56, 58, 59, 64, 72, 75, 79, 82, 106, 107, 108, 129. Comp. Alex. Chrys. iv. 257. Fulgent.

Qu. 53.—Ch. viii. 21 : Διὰ τί θυσιᾷ τῇ ἀγαθοποιῷ δυνάμει τοῦ θεοῦ, ἡ δὲ ἀποδοχὴ γίνεται διὰ δύο δυνάμεων τοῦ τε

Κυρίου καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ· φησὶ γὰρ· ὡσφράνθη Κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας ;

This title confirms the reading τῷ θεῷ in ch. viii. 20 ; see on Qu. 51.

Qu. 54.—Ch. viii. 21 : *Τί ἐστιν, εἶπε Κύριος ὁ θεὸς δια-
νοηθεὶς Οὐκ ἔτι προσθήσω καταράσασθαι τὴν γῆν διὰ τὰ ἔργα
τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ὅτι ἔγκειται ἡ διάνοια τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπιμελῶς
ἀεὶ ἐπὶ τὰ πονηρὰ ἐκ νεότητος. οὐκ οὖν ἔτι προσθήσω πατάξαι.
πᾶσαν σάρκα ζῶσαν καθὼς ἐποίησα, ἔτι (or rather ἀλλ' ἔτι).*

Here (i.) *ἔτι προσθήσω*, for *προσθ. ἔτι*.

(ii.) *ἀεὶ* added after *ἐπιμελῶς*.

(iii.) *αὐτοῦ* omitted after *νεότητος*.

(iv.) *οὐκ οὖν ἔτι προσθ.* for *οὐ προσθ. οὖν ἔτι*.

(v.) (? ἀλλὰ) *ἔτι* added after *ἐποίησα*.

Of these, (iii.) *αὐτοῦ* is omitted in (Holmes) 15, 20, 37, 55, 61, 64, 68, 74, 83, 120, 121, 129, 130, 134. Ald. Philo. i. 516. Epiph. i. 805, 951, 1034. Chrys. iv. 260. Cyr. Al. i. 488. Athan. i. 755. Ambr. (iv.) The meaning of the Arm. is here not quite clear, but certainly implies *ἔτι* which is added in (Holmes) 15, 55, 64, 74, 76, 134. As to (i.), it must be remarked that in the Armenian solutio Philo cites again part of his title thus : τὸ δὲ προσθήσω καταράσασθαι τὴν γῆν, λεγόμενον παγκαλῶς. We must not lay stress, therefore, on the transposition of words in title. (ii.) The addition of *ἀεὶ* is also doubtful, for, citing the verse in detail in the Armenian solutio Philo does not add *ἀεὶ* ; nor does any other source supply it. Nor in Philo Q. R. D. H. i. 516 is *ἀεὶ* added. The variant (iv.) is doubtfully indicated by the Armenian solutio.

Thus (iii.) the omission of *αὐτοῦ* and (v.) addition of *ἔτι* are the only ones of these variants certainly attributable to the text of Philo's LXX. The addition made in the title at the end of the verse answers to *ἀλλ' ἔτι* rather than to *ἔτι* singly. Perhaps a new clause began with these words. If so, why cite them with verse 21 ? See on the following quaestio.

Qu. 55.—Ch. viii. 22: *Τί ἐστι σπέρμα καὶ θερισμός, ψῦχος καὶ καῦμα, θέρος καὶ ἔαρ, ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα οὐ καταπαύσουσι* ;

Did Philo's LXX. omit the preceding words, *πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς γῆς* ? One MS. of Holmes, 25, omits them. The Armenian solutio does not imply them, indeed ; yet their omission may be due to title only. Most probably Philo began the verse with *σπέρμα*. Cp. Holmes's note on verse 21 : "*Vocem ἐποίησα connectit cum quinque prioribus verbis commatis proximi, eamque connectionem urget in commentario, Chrys. iv. 260.*" It is impossible not to connect the reading of Chrysostom with the Philonean titles of this and the preceding verse.

Qu. 56.—Ch. ix. 1, 2: *Διὰ τί εὐλογεῖ τὸν Νῶε καὶ τοὺς υἱούς, εἰπὼν· Αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε καὶ πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν καὶ κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς καὶ ὁ τρόμος ὑμῶν καὶ ὁ φόβος ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῖς θηρίοις καὶ τοῖς πετεινοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἔρπετοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἰχθύσιν, ἃ (or ἄς or οὓς) ὑπὸ χεῖρας ὑμῶν δέδωκα* ;

Here (i.) *ὁ θεὸς* is omitted after *εὐλογεῖ*.

(ii.) *αὐτοῦ* is omitted after *τοὺς υἱούς*.

(iii.) *αὐτοῖς* after *εἰπὼν*.

(iv.) *καὶ ὁ τρόμος ὑμῶν καὶ ὁ φόβος*, instead of *καὶ ὁ τροκ. ὁ φ. ὑμῶν*.

(v.) *πᾶσι* omitted before *τοῖς θηρίοις*, and *τῆς γῆς* after it.

(vi.) *καὶ τοῖς πετεινοῖς* for *ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*.

(vii.) *καὶ τοῖς ἔρπετοῖς* for *καὶ ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ κινούμενα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*.

(viii.) *καὶ τοῖς ἰχθύσιν* for *καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἰχθύας τῆς θαλάσσης*.

(ix.) *ἃ* (or *οὓς*) is added before *ὑπὸ χεῖρας*.

(i.) This omission may be due to title. In one parallel case, ch. viii. 1, *ὁ θεὸς* is given ; in another, ch. vii. 1, *Κύριος ὁ θεὸς* is omitted. On the whole, it is probable that in Philo's LXX., *ὁ θεὸς* was absent in ch. ix. 1, and that the subject was supplied from *Κύριος ὁ θεός* in ch. viii. 21.

(ii.) *αὐτοῦ* may have been omitted in Philo's LXX., which seems to have been altogether shorter and terser than our

own, but in the absence of evidence from other sources we cannot be sure.

(iii.) This omission is due to title.

(iv.) This variant is preserved in (Holmes) I., 19, 31, 58, 68, 120, 121, 129. Ald. Alex. Georg. It is certain, therefore, that it stood in Philo's LXX.

The other variants (v.-ix.), in absence of other evidence, must be set down to title.

The solutio of this quaestio cites Gen. i. 27, 28, thus : καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν· ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς. καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς ὁ θεὸς λέγων Αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε καὶ πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν καὶ κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς καὶ ἄρχετε τῶν ἰχθύων καὶ τῶν πετεινῶν καὶ τῶν ἐρπετῶν τῆς γῆς.

The omissions in this citation must be set down to title in absence of further evidence.

Lower down in the same solutio are cited parts of Gen. ii. 5, 7, as follows : οὐ γὰρ ἔβρεξεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἦν ὁ ἐργαζόμενος τὴν γῆν. (7) καὶ ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς· καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν.

Here, in verse 5, ὁ ἐργαζόμενος τὴν γῆν for ἐργάζεσθαι αὐτήν. The reading τὴν γῆν was in Philo's LXX., for it is given in Philo i. 47, as also in (Holmes) X., 14, 15, 16, 20, 25, 32, 38, 55, 56, 57, 59, 72, 73, 74, 78, 79, 83, 127, 128, 129, 131, 134. Comp. Alex. Cat. Nic. Athan. i. 417, Chrys. iv. 93, *et saepe*. The phrase ὁ ἐργαζόμενος, for ἐργάζεσθαι, does not appear to be a mere device of rendering, for it is also found in the Armenian Vulgate.

Qu. 57.—Ch. ix. 3 : Διὰ τί πᾶν ἐρπετὸν ὃ ἐστι ζῶν ὑμῖν ἔσται φησι εἰς βρώσιν ;

Qu. 58.—Ch. ix. 3 : Τί ἐστίν, ὡς λάχανα χόρτου ἔδωκα ὑμῖν τὰ πάντα ;

The Armenian implies ἔδωκα rather than δέδωκα. ἔδωκα is given in Alex.

Qu. 59.—Ch. ix. 4: *Τί ἐστι, κρέας ἐν αἵματι ψυχῆς οὐ φάγεσθε* ;

This title is preserved in Greek (R. Harris, p. 25), but is there given thus: *Τί ἐστὶν ἐν αἵματι ψυχῆς κρέας οὐ φάγεσθε* ; This discrepancy suggests that in Philo's LXX. *κρεας* was wholly absent, and was afterwards interpolated in his text, but as naturally happens in such cases, was inserted in one copy here and in another there. That this was so is almost certain from the omission of *κρέας* in (Holmes) 38, Orig. ii. 32, Arm. 2, and also from Philo's *solutio* (for Greek of which see R. Harris, p. 25), which implies the absence rather than the presence of *κρέας* in his text of LXX. The *solutio* contains Leviticus, ch. xvii. 11, *πάσης ψυχῆς σώματος τὸ αἷμα ἐστι*, where the Armenian must be corrupt, as it yields no sense.

Qu. 60.—Ch. ix. 5: *Τί ἐστι τὸ ὑμέτερον αἷμα τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν ἐκζητήσω ἐκ πάντων θηρίων, καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς ἀνθρώπου ἀδελφοῦ.*

Here Tischendorf reads: *ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν θηρίων ἐκζητήσω αὐτό, κ.τ.λ.*

Holmes's codex 75, Tert. Lucif. Cal., and Chrys. ii. 32, give the verse exactly as in the title, only retaining *χειρὸς* before *πάντων τῶν ζώων*. Minor agreements of the sources with the title are the following :

(i.) *ἐκζητήσω* is added after *ψυχῶν ὑμῶν* in I., 15, 25, 37, 38, 55, 56, 58, 59, 61, 74, 75, 76, 79, 82, 106, 128, 130, 134. Alex. Damasc. i. 301. Theodoret iv. 745. Arm. 1, 2. Arm. Ed. But these sources repeat *ἐκζητήσω αὐτό*.

(ii.) *χειρὸς* before *πάντων τῶν θ.*, is omitted in Theodoret iv. 745.

(iii.) *αὐτό* after *ἐκζητήσω* is omitted in (Holmes) 107, 135.

Undoubtedly Philo read the passage in his LXX. according to the title. Did he not also read in his LXX. the words *ἐκζητήσω τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, which follow and end the verse in our LXX. ? The Armenian *solutio* (which

is fairly rendered in Aucher's Latin) in no way implies the addition, and Philo's commentary continues with verse 6. It is therefore probable that ἐκζ. τ. ψ. τοῦ ἀνθ. is an addition later than Philo.

Qu. 61.—Ch. ix. 6: *Τί ἐστίν, ὃ ἐκχέων αἷμα ἀνθρώπου ἀντὶ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ ἐκχυθήσεται;*

I suspect that this title has been tampered with in the original Greek, if not in the Armenian version, and that for αὐτοῦ Philo himself wrote αὐτὸς, for in the Armenian solutio we read thus: αὐτὸς γάρ φησι ἐκχυθήσεται ὥσπερ αἷμα ὃ ἐκχέων αἷμα, which Ambrose, *De Noe et Arca*, n. 98, renders: "Eo quod is qui effuderit sanguinem hominis ipse quasi sanguis effundetur." This renders it practically certain that Philo read in his LXX. αὐτὸς ἐκχυθήσεται. The reading of Chrys. iv. 262, ἀντὶ τοῦ αἵματος τὸ αὐτοῦ, led Holmes to conjecture that the uncial codices originally had αἷμα τὸ εἰκονοῦ, which was easily corrupted into αἷματος αὐτοῦ; but αὐτὸς was clearly the reading in Philo's age.

Qu. 62.—Ch. ix. 6: *Διὰ τί ὥσπερ περὶ ἐτέρου θεοῦ, φησι, ὅτι ἐν εἰκόνι θεοῦ ἐποίησα τὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ οὐκ ἐν τῇ εἰκονί;*

Qu. 63.—Ch. ix. 11: *Τί ἐστίν, οὐκέτι ἔσται κατακλυσμὸς καταφθεῖραι πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν;*

Here ὕδατος is omitted after κατάκλυσμος. So in (Holmes) 131. Ambr. Slav.

Qu. 64.—Ch. ix. 13: *Διὰ τί σημεῖον τοῦ μὴ γενέσθαι ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν κατακλυσμὸν φησι τιθέναι τὸ τόξον αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ;*

In the solutio is a more direct citation: τὸ τόξον μου τίθημι ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ.

Qu. 65.—Ch. ix. 18, 19: *Διὰ τί τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ δικαίου ἀναμνησθεῖς Σὴμ, Χάμ, 'Ιάφεθ, τὸ τοῦ μέσου γένος μόνον ἱστορεῖ, λέγων Χάμ ἦν πατὴρ τοῦ Χαναάν, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπιφέρει, οὗτοι τρεῖς υἱοὶ Νῶε.*

Here (i.) δὲ is omitted after Χάμ.

(ii.) τοῦ added before Χαναάν.

(iii.) οὗτοι τρεῖς for τρεῖς οὗτοί εἰσι.

(i.) is found in I., III., X., 14, 16, 18, 31, 35, 57, 68, 73, 78, 82, 120, 121, 128, 129. Ald. Arm. 1. Arm. Ed. habet in charact. minore Alex. (ii.) is in Chrys. iv. 272. (iii.) is not found in any other source. Variants (i.) and (ii.) were, we infer, in Philo's LXX. Less probably (iii.) was in it also; for Procopius (Wendland, p. 61) preserves the title in Greek, but cites it thus: *τρεις οὗτοι υἱοὶ τοῦ Νῶε*.

Qu. 66.—Ch. ix. 20: *Τί ἐστιν, ἤρξατο Νῶε ἄνθρωπος εἶναι γεωργὸς γῆς*;

To this quaestio is prefixed in the best Armenian MSS. the words, *περὶ γεωργίας*, as if this and the following sections of the commentary which followed were known separately under that title.

In the above title *εἶναι* is added before *γεωργὸς*. So also in Philo i. 303, 319, 328, 329. So it is certain that Philo in his LXX. read *εἶναι* here.

In the Armenian solutio is embedded Gen. ch. i. 9, as follows: *συναχθήτω τὸ ὕδωρ εἰς συναγωγὴν μίαν, καὶ ὀφθήτω ἡ ξηρά*. The beginning of the solutio, including this citation, is preserved in Greek in Procopius (*see* Wendland, p. 36); there the citation is given exactly as in the Armenian, except that *τὴν* is added before *συναγωγὴν*. The omission after *ὕδωρ* of *τὸ ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* is in no other source, and must therefore be due to citation.

Qu. 67.—Ch. ix. 20: *Διὰ τί ὁ δίκαιος πρῶτον ἀμπελῶνα φυτεύει*;

Qu. 68.—Ch. ix. 21: *Τί ἐστιν, ἔπιεν ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου καὶ ἐμεθύσθη*;

Qu. 69.—Ch. ix. 21: *Τί ἐστιν, ἐγυμνώθη ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ*;

Qu. 70.—Ch. ix. 22: *Διὰ τί οὐχ ἀπλῶς ἔφη, εἶδε Χὰμ τὴν γύμνωσιν, ἀλλὰ εἶδε Χὰμ ὁ πατήρ Χαναὰν τὴν γύμνωσιν τοῦ πατρὸς*;

Here *αὐτοῦ* is omitted after *πατρός*. The omission is in no other source; yet from the uniform way in which *αὐτοῦ* is omitted in such collocations, it is probable that the omission existed in Philo's LXX.

Qu. 71.—Ch ix. 22. *Τί ἐστιν ἀνήγγειλε τοῖς δυσὶν ἀδελφοῖς ἔξω ;*

Here *αὐτοῦ* is again omitted, and the omission is also found in (Holmes) 37 ("sed habet margo"). X. has *αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ*; and this is in itself significant, for a conflict between the earliest MSS. as to the place of a word in a sentence is often an indication that at an earlier stage the text was altogether without it, as seems to have been here the case. Philo's LXX., therefore, omitted *αὐτοῦ* here; cp. note on preceding quaestio.

Qu. 72.—Ch. ix. 23: *Τί ἐστι, λαβόντες Σῆμ καὶ Ἰάφεθ ἰμάτιον ἐπέθεντο ἐπὶ τὰ δύο νῶτα καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ὑπισθοφανῶς καὶ ἐκάλυψαν τὴν γύμνωσιν τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ οὐκ εἶδον ;*

Here (i.) *τὸ* is omitted before *ἰμάτιον*.

(ii.) *ἐκάλυψαν* for *συνεκάλυψαν*.

(iii.) *αὐτῶν* omitted after *πατρὸς*, and after *νῶτα*.

(iv.) *καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν ὅπ., καὶ τὴν γ. τ. πατρὸς* are omitted before *οὐκ εἶδον*.

Of these variants (i.), (ii.), and (iii.) may be at once set down to Philo's LXX.; *ἐκάλυψαν* is found in (Holmes) 108 Compl.; and for the omission of *αὐτῶν* see note on the two preceding quaestiones. The first *αὐτῶν* after *νῶτα* is omitted in (Holmes) Arm. 1, 2.

The only parallel to the larger omission (iv.) is in (Holmes) 75, which, however, omits the entire clause from *καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον* to *οὐκ εἶδον* inclusive. The quaestio renders *καὶ*, or we might suppose that Philo's eye, in making the citation from his LXX., ran on from the first to the second *τοῦ πατρὸς*, and so omitted the intervening words through homoioteleuton. The solutio of this quaestio is preserved in Greek (see R. Harris, p. 28), but is not decisive for or against this large omission. I believe, however, that the words *τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν ὑπισθοφανῶς* (or *ὑπισθοφανῆς*) were a marginal gloss on *ὅπ. ἐπορεύθησαν*, which found its way into the text after Philo's day, and that the words *τὴν γύμνωσιν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν* were added

at the same time before οὐκ εἶδον to make the meaning quite precise.

Qu. 73.—Ch. ix. 24; *Τί ἐστιν, ἐξένηψε Νῶε ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴνου.*

Qu. 74.—Ch. ix. 24: *Διὰ τί τὸν Χὰμ μέσον τοῦ σπέρματος νομίζων τῶν τριῶν ἀδελφῶν, ἕτερον (?) νεώτερον ὀνομάζει εἰπών· ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ υἱὸς ὁ νεώτερος;*

Here αὐτοῦ is omitted after ὁ υἱὸς. So also in Philo i. 392, 397. It is therefore certain that αὐτοῦ was absent in Philo's LXX.

Qu. 75.—Ch. ix. 26: *Διὰ τί τῷ Σῆμ εὐξάμενος οὕτως ἐφῆ Εὐλογητὸς (or rather εὐλογημένος) Κύριος ὁ θεός, θεὸς τοῦ Σῆμ, καὶ ἔσται Χαναὰν παῖς αὐτοῦ;*

Here (i.) θεός is added before τοῦ Σῆμ. The commentary of Philo i. 400 proves that θεὸς stood here in his LXX.; the words are as follows: τὸν γὰρ Κύριον καὶ θεὸν τοῦ τε κόσμου καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ πάντων, ἰδίᾳ θεὸν, κατ' ἐξαίρετον χάριν, τοῦ Σῆμ ἀνακαλεῖ. The actual citation, however, in i. 400 and 401 has been conformed in the MSS. to the Greek Vulgate. The Armenian solutio, no less than the Greek Philo, involves the addition of θεός before τοῦ Σῆμ.

(ii.) παῖς instead of παῖς οἰκέτης. In Philo i. 400 is read: καὶ ἔσται Χαναὰν δούλος αὐτοῖς. The word οἰκέτης, which may have slipped in from the preceding verse, is omitted in (Holmes) I., VI., X., 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 25, 31, 32, 37, 38, 55, 56, 57, 58, 64, 68, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 82, 83, 107, 120, 121, 128, 129, 130, 131, 134, 135. Ald. Alex. Cat. Nic. Just. M. Dial., p. 432. Chrys. iv. 291. Cyr. Al. Glaph., p. 42. Theodoret i. 71. Aug. Copt. Arab. 1, 2.

In regard to the reading of δούλος in Philo i. 400, Holmes notes: "Forte igitur haud agnovit οἰκέτης."

It is therefore certain that Philo in his LXX. omitted οἰκέτης. Whether he also read εὐλογημένος, instead of εὐλογητὸς is less certain. In Philo i. 401 εὐλογημένος is read; in i. 400, εὐλογητός. Probably the former, which best answers to the Armenian, was read in Philo's LXX.

Qu. 76.—Ch. ix. 27: *Διὰ τί τῷ Ἰάφεθ εὐξάμενός φησι.*

πλατύναι ὁ θεὸς τῷ Ἰάφεθ καὶ κατοικιζέτω ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ Σήμ· καὶ γεννηθήτω Χανὰν παῖς αὐτῶν ;

Here (i.) κατοικιζέτω for κατοικησάτω. Although Mangey's text, at i. 101, gives κατοικησάτω, there can be no doubt that κατοικιζέτω stood in Philo's LXX.

(ii.) τῷ οἴκῳ for τοῖς οἴκοις. The latter is read in Philo i. 401. Without support from the Greek MSS. of Philo, it is not safe to infer that Philo read τῷ οἴκῳ in his LXX.

(iii.) αὐτῶν for αὐτοῦ. So (Holmes) I., X., 31, 57, 58, 59, 71, 73, 75, 78, 83, 108, 128, 129, 130. Compl. Alex. Copt. Arab. 1, 3. Arm. Ed. From Quaestio 77 it is certain that Philo read αὐτῶν in his LXX.

In Philo i. 401, δοῦλος is again read here, instead of παῖς, a discrepancy that is remarkable in view of the next quaestio. The Armenian implies the form Χανὰν, rather than Χαναὰν.

Qu. 77.—Ch. ix. 27: Διὰ τί τοῦ Χὰμ ἀμαρτόντος, τὸν ἐκείνου (or αὐτοῦ) υἱὸν τὸν Χανὰν δοῦλον ἀποφαίνει τοῦ Σήμ καὶ τοῦ Ἰαφέθ ;

In S. Ambr., *De Noe et Arca*, this title is thus paraphrased: Deinde qua ratione cum filius (?) eius Cham peccaverit, non ipsum, sed filius eius servituti addixit ?

The above title proves that in ch. ix. 27, Philo read αὐτῶν in his LXX., and leads one to ask whether, after all, the reading δοῦλος did not stand in his LXX. instead of παῖς in verses 26 and 27, if not in the text, anyhow in the margin. There can be no question of the titles of Quaestiones 75 and 76 having been influenced by the Armenian Vulgate, for that translates δοῦλος in verses 26, 27. On the other hand, St. Ambrose's paraphrase above cited proves that δοῦλος was read in Q. 77. We can only conclude that the two readings παῖς and δοῦλος are in verses 26, 27, both equally Philonean.

Qu. 78.—Ch. ix. 28: Διὰ τί μετὰ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν Νῶε ἔζησε ἔτη τριακόσια καὶ πενήκοντα ;

Tischendorf reads: ἔζησε δὲ Ν. μετὰ τὸν κατακ. ἔτη τρι.

πεντ. The variation in order of words may be ascribed to title.

Qu. 79.—Ch. ix. 18, and x. 1: *Διὰ τί τῶν τριῶν υἱῶν. Νῶε Χὰμ αἰὲ μέσος φαίνεται· τὰ δὲ ἄκρα ἀλλοιοῦνται· ὅτε γεγέννηνται μὲν πρώτου τοῦ Σὴμ γεγραμμένου, οὕτως. Σὴμ, Χάμ, Ἰάφεθ· ὅτε δὲ γεννῶσι, πρῶτος τέτακται Ἰάφεθ καὶ ἄρχεται ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰάφεθ γενεαλογεῖν;*

This title implies in ch. x. verse 1, the following order among Noe's sons, *Ἰάφεθ, Χάμ, Σὴμ*, the inverse of the order in ch. ix. 18. The Armenian solutio equally implies that Philo, in his LXX., so read ch. x. 1. It begins as follows: *οἱ τὴν ῥητὴν τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων φύσιν διερευνῶμενοι λόγων εὔρεται περὶ διατάξεως τὸν κατ' ἀρχὴν λεγόμενον πρῶτον τὸν Σὴμ νεώτερον ὑπέλαβον, τὸν δὲ ὕστατον πρεσβύτερον τὸν Ἰάφεθ.*

Qu. 80.—Ch. x. 4, 5: *Διὰ τί ἐκ τοῦ Ἰάφεθ, Κήτιοι, Ρόδιοι καὶ Νῆσοι τῶν ἐθνῶν;*

Qu. 81.—Ch. x. 6: *Διὰ τί τοῦ Χὰμ πρεσβύτερος υἱὸς Χούς.*

The Armenian spelling answers to *Choush*.

Qu. 82.—Ch. x. 8, 9: *Διὰ τί Χούς γεννᾷ τὸν Νεβρώθ. δς ἤρξατο γίγας κυνηγὸς εἶναι ἐναντίον Κυρίου. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐρούσιν ὡς Νεβρώθ γίγας Κυνηγὸς ἐναντίον θεοῦ;*

Here (i.) *δς* is used for *οὗτος*.

(ii.) *γίγας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. οὗτος ἦν* omitted after *ἤρξατο εἶναι*.

(iii.) *τοῦ θεοῦ* is omitted after *Κυρίου*.

(iv.) *καὶ* is added before *διὰ τοῦτο*.

(v.) *τοῦ θεοῦ* for *Κυρίου*.

(vi.) *Νεβρώθ* for *Νεβρώδ*.

Of these variants (iii.) is in (Holmes) I., 15, 82, 129, 135, and may be set down at once to Philo's LXX. So may (v.), which is in (Holmes) 56, 129, while *τοῦ θεοῦ* is added after *Κυρίου* in (Holmes) X., 15, 18, 25, 32, 57, 58, 72, 73, 75, 76, 78, 79, 82, 106, 107, 130, 134. Compl. Cat. Nic. Orig. ii. 34. Chrys. iv. 292. Cyr. Al. iii. 440. Arm. Ed. et sic xii. Codd. Arm. The spelling *Νεβρώθ* (vi.) is in

(Holmes) 31, 72, 75. Theoph. 106. Epiph. i. 7. Aug., and may, therefore, be accepted as Philo's.

In Philo, *De Gigantibus*, i. 272, is given the citation, οὗτος ἤρξατο εἶναι γίγας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, rendering it almost certain that the other variants are mere devices of citation. The Armenian solutio also cites the first words of verse 9 thus : δι' ἣν αἰτίαν οὐ μάτην ἔχει τὸ ἦν γίγας ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ.

F. C. CONYBEARE.
